



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,425	10/31/2003	Dianne Ellis	02-292	3280
62753	7590	07/22/2009		
VALERIE CALLOWAY CHIEF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COUNSEL POLYMER GROUP, INC. 9335 HARRIS CORNERS PARKWAY SUITE 300 CHARLOTTE, NC 28269			EXAMINER	
			SINGH-PANDEY, ARTI R	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/22/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/699,425	Applicant(s) ELLIS ET AL.
	Examiner Arti Singh-Pandey	Art Unit 1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **14 May 2009**.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) **4 and 15-22** is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) **4 and 15-22** is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/14/09.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's amendments and accompanying remarks dated 05/14/2009. Applicant's amendments to the claims have been entered and are made of record. The amendments overcome any prior rejection, which are now withdrawn. A new rejection has been set forth below.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 4 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5522942 issued to Graubart et al in view of USPN 7013541 issued to Rivera et al (date relied upon is that of the provisional application).

Graubart et al. disclose wipes for cleaning hard surfaces. Said wipes comprise a synergistic cleaning composition has been discovered comprising an aqueous solution a quaternary ammonium compound component; a nonionic surfactant component; and a glycol ether solvent. Surprisingly, the combination of the quaternary ammonium compound component, the nonionic surfactant component, and glycol ether solvent provides a synergistic effect where the cleaning composition functions with a low level

of quaternary ammonium compound component while still maintaining at least one of the following desirable properties, as follows: an acceptable cleaning efficacy; a low level irritation or toxicity profile; and/or a broad spectrum antimicrobial activity. The Examiner is equating the glycol ether solvent as the cationic portion of the mixture required by the current set of claims. Graubart et al do not disclose the structural and chemical makeup of the nonwoven itself or the additional layers. This is remedied by Rivera et al.

Rivera et al. discloses two side imaged nonwoven having additional scrim layers or additional support layers (film) within their composite. Said nonwoven are natural staple length carded and cross lapped. Said nonwoven can be made into hard surface wipes. The fibers used to create the nonwoven can be natural fibers.

With regards to claims 19-22, in which the additional scrim layer or film is required; Graubart et al. teaches a nonwoven wipe having the nonionic/cationic/dual quaternary antimicrobial composition present as a coating on a nonwoven hard surface wipe. They do not disclose that the nonwoven is imaged or that there is an additional scrim/film layer within the wipe. This is remedied by Rivera et al.

Rivera et al. discloses two side imaged nonwoven having additional scrim and or film layers within their composite. Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to have used the composite of Rivera et al. as the base substrate for the wipes created by Graubart et al. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide more strength and durability to the overall composite.

It should be noted that although applicant desires to apply the coating at different times the method of making an article is not germane to the issue of patentability of the article itself, as a skilled artisan would not be able to differentiate when or how the coatings were applied in the final product.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arti Singh-Pandey whose telephone number is 571-272-1483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Tarazano can be reached on 571-272-1515. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Arti Singh-Pandey/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794

asp